

Application No.: 10/696,180  
Amendment dated: April 30, 2012  
Reply to Office Action of: January 31, 2012

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action dated January 31, 2012.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's thorough examination of the application as evidenced by the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims in this application are patentable over the cited art and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in light of the following remarks.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103**

#### *Independent Claim 1*

At page 3, the Office Action indicates that Claim 1 stands rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,344,796 to Ogilvie et al. (“*Ogilvie*”) in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0130065 to Bloom (“*Bloom*”) in further view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2003/0037009 to Tobin et al. (“*Tobin*”) and U.S. Patent 6,976,090 of Ben-Shaul et al. (“*Ben-Shaul*”). The Applicants respectfully submit that *Ogilvie*, *Bloom*, *Tobin*, and *Ben-Shaul* fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in amended Claim 1, alone or in combination. For example, *Ogilvie*, *Bloom*, *Tobin*, and *Ben-Shaul* fail to disclose or suggest the concept of “providing the ADL to the vendor computer system to use as the shipping location for the product purchased by the customer via the web browser enhancement tool automatically populating form fields of a vendor web page to provide the ADL address for upload to the vendor computer system and deducting the fee from the digital wallet,” as recite in Claim 1. The Office Action concedes that *Ogilvie* does not disclose this concept and asserts that *Bloom* cures this deficiency. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

As generally described in paragraphs [0062], [0065], and [0066], the *Bloom* system maintains an ePD Billing & Maintenance application that generally collects and maintains data related to customers, recipients, retailers, customer distribution centers (CDCs), regional distribution centers (RDCs) and shippers *for use in the shipping operations of all shippers*. The *Bloom* system maintains this information centrally (*see* paragraph [0065]). Read-only copies of this information may also be available on the retailers’ and shippers’ systems to facilitate order processing for customers. *Id.* Figs. 9A-9G illustrate the types of data that are stored on either a

Application No.: 10/696,180

Amendment dated: April 30, 2012

Reply to Office Action of: January 31, 2012

retailer workstation or server computer (see e.g., Paragraph [0066]). Thus, *Bloom* the information relating to a customer's default destination centralized pickup location is retrieved from the alleged vendor system (i.e. the retailer or shipper). In contrast, Claim 1 recites that "providing the ADL to the vendor computer system to use as the shipping location for the product purchased by the customer via the web browser enhancement tool automatically populating form fields of a vendor web page to provide the ADL address for upload to the vendor computer system...." *Bloom* merely discloses data for multiple customers being stored centrally at the retailer or shipper.

It is noted that *Ben-Shaul* has been cited for the concept of a web browser tool; however, this reference does not cure the deficiencies identified above with respect to the *Bloom* reference. *Ben-Shaul* generally describes a technique for the transmission of content and applications across an internet. See Col. 1, lines 13-20. This technique involves a model termed differentiated content and application delivery (DCAD). See Col. 5, lines 40-42. In this model, content delivery is completely decentralized by delegation and off-loading of functionality and control from an origin site to a new web entity referred to as an edge server. See Col. 5, lines 42-63. In preferred embodiments of *Ben-Shaul*, each origin site has a set of subordinate edge servers that are geographically distributed and reside in the "edges" of the internet. See Col. 5, lines 64-66. Thus, requests for the origin site's content may be fulfilled by these edge servers. See Col. 6, line 65 to Col. 7, line 14.

The Office Action pieces different portions of the *Ben-Shaul* reference together in an attempt to derive the recited web browser enhancement tool. Each of these sections of *Ben-Shaul* is addressed below.

First the Office Action cites column 9, lines 12-17 but actually quotes portions of text from column 9 extending from about line 12 to about line 45. *Ben-Shaul* describes that services can be enabled on an edge server by downloading of CDML instructions and data structures onto the server. These particular services involve configuring and/or enabling the particular edge server to manipulate the availability and presentation of content for users. Such disclosure does not teach or suggest the feature of Claim 1 in which a web browser enhancement tool is provided to a customer that resides in the customer's browser and is configured to record and retain the customer's selected ADL from the list of ADLs. The cited section of *Ben-Shaul* describes

Application No.: 10/696,180

Amendment dated: April 30, 2012

Reply to Office Action of: January 31, 2012

downloading instructions and data structures that reside on an edge server and are executed to configure and/or enable the server to perform certain services. These instructions and data structures **do not reside in a customer's browser**, nor do they described services that involve recording and retaining the customer's selected ADL so that the ADL may be provided to a vendor computer system to use as a shipping location for a product purchased by the customer.

Second, the Office Action cites to Fig. 9 and column 37, lines 30-34. This section merely describes the interaction between the edge server and the original server. There is no discussion of a customer's browser. Indeed, Fig. 9 shows the user computer being separate from the "edge servers."

Third, the Office Action cites to column 10, lines 6-24. As quoted in the Office Action, this section describes particular edge servers copying or allocating content fetched from the original site. The data fetched from the original site may be stored within a local file system. Here again, the operations and storage is described in relation to an edge server. There is no disclosure of this information residing on a customer's browser.

Finally, the Office Action cites column 43, lines 1-8. This section explains that the edge server executes applications that would normally execute on the original site or original server. There is no mention of information being recorded or retained in a customer's browser.

In summary, the combination of these different portions of *Ben-Shaul* at most disclose that an edge server can manipulate the availability and presentation of content fetched from other servers. The disclosure does not teach or suggest the feature of Claim 1 in which a web browser enhancement tool is provided to a customer that resides in the customer's browser and is configured to record and retain the customer's selected ADL from the list of ADLs.

For at least the reasons identified above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or suggest each of the features recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Application No.: 10/696,180  
Amendment dated: April 30, 2012  
Reply to Office Action of: January 31, 2012

Dependent Claims 2-3 and 7-19

The patentability of the independent claim has been argued as set forth above and thus the Applicants will not take this opportunity to argue the merits of the rejection with regard to the dependent claims. However, the Applicants do not concede that the dependent claims are not independently patentable and reserve the right to argue the patentability of the dependent claims at a later date if necessary.

**Conclusion**

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed January 31, 2012. The foregoing amendments to the claims, when taken in conjunction with the appended remarks, are believed to have placed the present application in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey A. Cooper/

Jeffrey A. Cooper  
Registration No. 54,747

**Customer No. 00826**  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000  
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

Application No.: 10/696,180

Amendment dated: April 30, 2012

Reply to Office Action of: January 31, 2012

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON April 30, 2012.**